



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,047	10/12/2001	Steve J. Shields	DP-304607	3706

7590

04/10/2002

MARGARET A. DOBROWITSKY
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Staff, Mail Code: 480-414-420
P.O. Box 5052
Michigan, MI 48007-5052

EXAMINER

ADDISON, KAREN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/977,047

Applicant(s)

SHIELDS ET AL.

Examiner

Karen B Addison

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "whereby the through-bolt is subject to bending stress since it does not operate on a solid stack up" is vague and indefinite.

Examiner is not clear on the term "solid stack up" is applicant referring to a process?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-8, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson (5210453) in view of Crispell (4229875).

Nelson discloses an electrical ac generator in fig.3 having a housing (16) including a drive-end portion (12) and a mounting-end portion (20), and a stator (22) mountable for rotation within the housing. Wherein, one of the end portions including a plurality of

Art Unit: 2834

circumferentially spaced ears (17,46) having first apertures (A) therein and the other of said end portions including a corresponding plurality of circumferentially spaced ears (13) having threaded apertures received in one of said threaded apertures to bolt said housing ends together against the stator with a through-bolt (18) comprising a head portion (44), a elongated shank portion (c) and a threaded portion (42) extending from the elongated shank portion. Nelson does not disclose, the shank portion being neck down adjacent said threaded portion to a diameter sufficiently less than a minor diameter of threads in said threaded portion.

Crispell discloses in fig.2 a fatigue resistance fasteners comprising a bolt having a head (6), a shank (8), a threaded portion (20) and a neck down portion (13) having a diameter sufficiently less than a minor diameter of threads in said threaded portion for the purpose resisting fatigue. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ac generator of Nelson with the bolt of Crispell for the purpose improving fatigue characteristics.

3. Claims 2,6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Crispell as applied to claim 1,3-5, and 7-8 above, and further in view of Koppel (5433570).

As seen above in paragraph 2, Nelson discloses an ac generator having a housing wherein a through-bolt connects the housing ends together and Crispell discloses a bolt comprising a neck down portion. However, neither Nelson nor Crispell discloses the shank portion having two or more spaced necked-down portion.

Art Unit: 2834

Koppel disclose in fig.1 a shank having two necked down portions (14) for the purpose of producing a shank that can experience a maximum number of alternating motions without any danger or fracture. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ac generator of Nelson with the shank of Crispell and koppel for the purpose of eliminating bending load.

Referring to claims 4 and 8. No patentable weight has been given to the method of manufacturing limitations (i. e. rolled) since "even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen B Addison whose telephone number is 703-306-5855. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 703-308-1317. The fax phone numbers

Application/Control Number: 09/977,047
Art Unit: 2834

Page 5

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431
for regular communications and 703-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-
0956.

KBA
April 7, 2002


NESTOR RAMIREZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800